

**REMARKS****1. Objection to the disclosure because of the following informalities:  
"1000 A□":**

5

Regarding the informality in paragraph [0005] of the specification, "1000 A□" has been revised to "1000 Å". This amendment corrects a document file transfer error, and no new matter is introduced. Consideration of this amendment to the specification is requested.

10

**2. Objection to the claims because of lacking of a space between the  
claim number and the claim text in claims 1 and 8:**

A space between the claim number and the claim text in claims 1 and 8, as well as other dependent claims has been inserted. These amendments are merely to correct typographical errors, and no new matter is introduced. Consideration of these amendments to the claims is requested.

**3. Rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being  
anticipated by Nakazato et al. (US 5,314,068):**

Claim 1 is amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation of "the braces being spheroidic structures such that contact areas of the reticle and the braces are reduced" is added. These amendments are fully supported in the specification, such as in paragraph [0020], line 8. No new matter is entered.

Regarding US 5,314,068, Nakazato discloses a container for a plate-like article comprising four holding members 1a for holding the bottom surface of the substrate at its four corners, as well as four limiting members 1b and additional four limiting members 1c all being

effective to limit the lateral motion of the substrate, as described in column 3, lines 36-43. Because the holding members 1a work to hold the substrate, and each limiting member 1a has a large flat surface in contact with the substrate as illustrated in Fig.1, the substrate, such as a reticle, is easily damaged due to large contact areas between the limiting members 1a and the substrate.

In contrast to Nakazato's teaching, the present application, as recited in the amended claim 1, discloses a plurality of braces having a spheroidic structure respectively, and thus the contact area between each brace and the reticle to be supported is very small. In addition, the reticle transferring support further comprises a plurality of holders installed on the fringe of the supporting base for preventing the reticle from moving laterally. As a result, the braces would not cause any harmful damages to the reticle. On the other hand, Nakazato does not teach or suggest the structural limitation of the holding members (braces) 1a, and neither does the prior arts (US 6,216,873 and US 5,375,710) recited by the examiner in the Office action document. Thus, claim 1 includes a novel and unobvious limitation over Nakazato's teaching and any cited prior arts. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

Reconsideration of amended claims 1 and claim 2 is requested.

**4. Rejection of claims 5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazato et al. (US 5,314,068):**

Claims 5 and 7 are dependent on claims 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 5 and 7 is requested.

Regarding claim 8, the present applications discloses a reticle transferring method comprising:

- placing a reticle transferring support and a SMIF (standard mechanical interface) pod on a load port of a reticle stocker;  
utilizing a reticle clip to place a reticle into the reticle transferring support;  
5 utilizing a robot arm installed in the reticle stocker to carry the reticle from the reticle transferring support; and  
utilizing the robot arm to place the reticle into the SMIF pod.

The examiner deems that one of ordinary skill in the art would have  
10 known the use of robot for loading/unloading the reticle, and the applicant agrees with the examiner in this aspect. However, the spirit of claim 8 according to this application is not the use of the robot, but the use of the reticle transferring support as transferring intermedium. As recited in the description of the prior art of this application (see  
15 paragraph [0009]), the reticle is manually and directly placed in a reticle transferring support of the SMIF pod by a reticle clip, and adjusted to proper position. Since the reticle transferring support 10 of the SMIF pod has to keep a gap of 0.95mm on both sides for conforming to the SEMI standard, and moreover the contact area between the reticle  
20 16 and the rectangular braces 14 is too wide, the back surface of the reticle 16 is easily damaged. For the above reason, the method according to claim 8 utilizes the reticle transferring support, rather than the reticle transferring support of the SMIF pod, as transferring intermedium to fix the position of the reticle. Since the position of the reticle is fixed,  
25 the reticle can be then transferred to the SMIF pod by the robot arm with good accuracies. Thus, the applicant believes that claim 8 is not obvious in view of Nakazato et al. (US 5,314,068). Claims 9-11 are dependent on claim 8 and should be allowable if claim 8 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 8-11 is hereby requested in view of the above  
30 argument.

**5. Objection to claims 3, 4 and 6 as being dependant upon a rejected**

**base claim:**


Claims 3, 4 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening  
5 claims. The applicant notes and appreciates this allowance, and believes the limitation included in claim 4 suffices for differentiating from the cited prior arts. Thus, reconsideration of claims 3 and 6 is requested in view of the amendments made to claim 1.

10 **6. New claims 12-17:**

Claim 12 claims a reticle transferring support, which comprises the limitation of "positions of the braces being adjustable". The limitation finds support in the specification in paragraph [0020], and no new matter is entered. Since  
15 the examiner indicates that the limitation would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, independent claim 12 should be allowed. Claims 13-17 are dependent on claim 12 and should be allowable if claim 12 is found allowable. Consideration of claims 12-17 is politely requested.

20

Sincerely,

Date: 9/17/2004

25 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

30 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

(Please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone communication and I will return your call promptly.)